

**REMARKS**

This responds to the Office Action dated 6 August 2007. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-7, 10, 12 and 13 are presently pending in the application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 12 and 13 and has added new claim 14.

**Claim Objection**

The Examiner objected to claim 1 because of minor informalities. Applicant has amended claim 1 to remedy the noted informalities.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶2**

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2. Applicant has amended claim 3 to resolve the § 112 issue raised by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2. Applicant amended claim 12 to resolve the § 112 issue raised by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,651,797 to Tree in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,542,520 to Beisel. The Examiner also rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Tree in view of Beisel, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,531,309 to Kloss et al. The Examiner also rejected claims 5, 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tree in view of Beisel, further in view of Kloss, and still further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,564,546 to Molbak. The Examiner also rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tree in view of Beisel, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,663,538 to Cotton. The Examiner also rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tree in view of Beisel, further in view of Kloss and still further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,282,765 to Suzuki. The Examiner also rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tree in view of Beisel, further in view of Kloss, further in view of Molbak, further in view of Suzuki, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,472,819 to Constantino, and still further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,213,524 to Miyashita. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1-7, 10 and 12-13.

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to read “wherein said coins traverse said entertainment device while under the influence of gravity and said coins and said movable items are visible to said user during travel through said entertainment device, and wherein said entertainment device is configured to cause said coins, based on an ~~amount~~ value of said coins, to travel different paths and through different mechanical devices during said coin’s travel from said first end to said second end.” On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits Tree does not disclose these limitations. It is clear that Beisel also does not disclose the limitations of amended claim 1. As the Examiner states, Beisel discloses a “coin testing apparatus in which coins fall from a vibrating tray, over an edge. . . . When too many coins overwhelm the ramp, the

excess coins move onto ramp (6) and onto another ramp (10).” Beisel does not disclose anything related to causing “said coins, based on a value of said coins, to travel different paths and through different mechanical devices during said coin’s travel from said first end to said second end.” Instead, Beisel’s coins are all treated the same no matter their value as they fall over the edge of the vibrating tray.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 should be allowable over any combination of Tree and Beisel. Thus, claim 1, as well as claims 2-7, 10 and 12-13, which depend from claim 1, should be allowable over any combination of Tree and Beisel.

In addition, Applicant has amended claim 13 to read “the entertainment donation device of claim 1, ~~and~~ wherein said canister develops a report from information derived from the coins traversing the entertainment device, the canister including a coin slot which communicates with a monitor and a time clock, wherein when said coin slot detects a passing of said coins and collects information from the passing of the coins, said coin slot is configured to send a request signal to said time clock for time information to be sent to said monitor, said coin slot configured to send a collection signal to said monitor, said monitor configured to accept said time information, ~~and~~ said collection signal and the report and display the report and an indicator of at least one of: a value collected over a time interval, a number of donations over a time interval, a value collected while a certain display is active, and a number of donations while a certain display is active, and wherein said monitor is further configured to display the amount of donations attributable to a particular charity based upon the collection signal and time interval when the coins were received.” In addition to not including the limitations of claim 1, as discussed above, any of the Tree, Beisel, Kloss, or Molbak references, alone or in combination,

fail to disclose the limitations of claim 13. For this additional reason, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the rejection to claim 13.

**Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully submits that the present Application is in condition for allowance. Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims. Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned by telephone to expedite the prosecution of the present application if there remain any unresolved issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 12/6/07

By S. Brandon Owen  
S. Brandon Owen  
Registration No. 60,525